DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 465 SO 012 392

AUTHOR Kraft, Richard J.
TITLE A Comparative Analysis of Individualism and Collectivism in Post-Industrial America and Post-Revolutionary China.
PUB DATE 2 Nov 78
NOTE 19p.: Paper presented at Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association (Albuquerque, NM, November 2, 1978).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement: American Culture: Civil Liberties: Communism: Comparative Analysis: *Comparative Education: Developed Nations: Developing Nations: *Educational Philosophy: Educational Policy: Educational Trends: Elementary Secondary Education: Foreign Countries: Higher Education: *Individualism: Political Attitudes: *Social Attitudes: *Socialization: Social Responsibility: Teaching Methods: *Values
IDENTIFIERS China

ABSTRACT

Collectivist versus individualistic attitudes in China and the United States are compared with particular emphasis on the effects of these attitudes on educational objectives and practice in China. Individualism is interpreted to include attitudes such as personal liberty, individual initiative, moral relativism, and self-direction. This individualistic approach in the United States has fostered tax cutting referenda, self-centered semi-religious movements, and deification of the self in group therapy. Collectivism is interpreted as group control over production and distribution. It is exemplified by social consciousness and, in its most extreme form, by idolatry of the state. In China, positive attitudes toward collectivism are reinforced by encouraging cooperation rather than competition among children beginning in the earliest grades, by generally recommending submission of individual will to the needs of the group, and by encouraging early and active participation in Communist youth organizations. There have been some changes in education since the cultural revolution, however, which indicate that Chinese educators and policy makers are realizing the need to reinforce some individualistic attitudes. Major changes include emphasis on excellence, achievement, and competition rather than political indoctrination: tracking students according to ability: reinforcing the authority role of the teacher in the classroom: and providing professional education for able students. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard Kraft

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED183465

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM IN POST-INDUSTRIAL AMERICA AND POST-REVOLUTIONARY CHINA

by

Richard F. Kraft
Professor of Education
University of Colorado

SP 012 392

A paper presented at the
Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association
Rocky Mountain Educational Studies Association
Albuquerque, New Mexico

November 2, 1978

A Comparative Analysis of
Individualism and Collectivism in
Post-Industrial America and Post-Revolutionary China

Shortly before leaving for China in May of this year, I came across Elizabeth Cagan's provocative article in the Harvard Educational Review, entitled "Individualism, Collectivism, and Radical Educational Reform." In that article, Cagan makes the case that the radical school reform movement in the United States failed due to the pervasive American commitment to the primacy of the individual over the group. We idealize such concepts as personal liberty, individual initiative and the private search for happiness, which when combined with a capitalist economic system, all too often leads to competitive, egotistic, and atomized social relations. Self-determination, self-actualization and self-direction are the components of this American individualist ethic, and lead to a morality of individual whim. She concludes that in recent years, this preoccupation with the individual has led us into what might more accurately be described as narcissism.[1]

The use of the word narcissism sparked my interest and brought back to mind Peter Marin's 1975 discussion on "The New Narcissism," in which he also attacks the deification of the isolated self in therapy and the selfishness and moral blindness which pervade American society under the guise of enlightenment and psychic health. Lifeboat ethics, with its denial of moral responsibility to our fellow humans, EST, with its destruction of moral and historical concerns, and the countless new therapies in which the self replaces community, relation, neighbor or God, all come in for a stinging attack. He then summarizes his position in a statement that captured my thoughts throughout much of my time in China, and since then as I have pondered what I saw, and reflected once again on the society which Mao and his followers have built.

> The end result of this retreat from the complexities of the world is a kind of soft fascism: the denial, in the name of higher truth, of the claims of others upon the self. Our deification of the self becomes equal in effect and human cost to what Nietzsche long ago called the "idolotry of the state." Just as persons once set aside the posisbilities of their own humanity and turned instead to the state for a sense of power and identity no longer theirs, so we now turn to the self, giving it the power and importance of a god. In the worship of the state, life gives way to an abstraction, to the total submission of individual will. In the worship of the self, life also gives way to an abstraction, in this case to an exaggeration of the will. The result in both cases is the same. What is lost is the immense middle ground of human community. The web of reciprocity and relation is broken. The world diminishes. The felt presence of the other disappears, and with it a part of our own existence.[2]

With Marin and Cagan, I would hold that we in the United States are out on a precarious individualistic limb, while China, on the other hand, is perhaps caught on the opposite end of Marin's continuum, with its idolatry of the state. Winds of change are blowing throughout the Chinese society, and the past six to eighteen months have seen rather dramatic changes in the Chinese treatment of the individual, with a good deal of evidence that they are moving towards the "middle ground" of which Marin speaks. I would like to hope that American society is moving away from its current narcissism, but the evidence appears to be overwhelmingly against making such a statement.

Perhaps coming from Boulder, Colorado, the "laid back," "mellow" capital of the Rockies, gives me a slightly jaundiced perspective, but let me briefly marshall some of the evidence. Proposition 13 in California was the greatest robbery of a state treasury by the wealthy landlord class in America's history, voted in by taxpayers "taking care of number 1." Next Tuesday, other taxpayers throughout the country get to vote to keep their tax bills down at the expense of the poor, the educators, and a host of social service agencies.

Robert Ringer exhorts us to take care of ourselves in his best selling books, Winning Through Intimidation, and Looking Out for Number One.

> Looking out for Number One is important because it leads to a simple, uncomplicated life in which you spend more time doing those things which give you the greatest amount of pleasure.[3]

If pure selfishness isn't enough, then Ringer and a host of other writers tell us how to become more assertive and aggressive, so that we can become winners, through the use of intimidation. Even religion becomes a party to this nonsense with countless deceptive schemes by Christian and Eastern religious gurus alike. Individual salvation replaces the role of the church and the religious community, so that it becomes increasingly difficult for the Church to speak with any convincing voice in the current moral morass. The western church speaks of the need for freedom, ignoring its own tradition of speaking out against injustice, and most of the religious and semi-religious movements from TM to EST to the Moonies, have an even worse track record in dealing with the problems of hunger, war and injustice in the world today. Perhaps EST best epitomizes the narcissism of America in 1978 with its beliefs that

> "the world is perfect, each of us is all-powerful, shame and guilt are merely arbitrary notions, truth is identical to belief and suffering is merely the result of imperfect consciousness...If each of us is totally responsible for their fate, then all the others in the world are responsible for their fate, and if that is so, why should we worry about them."[4]

All of this leads me to a society which is just about as far removed from what I have been describing as it is possible to be. I was born in China, thirty-seven years ago, and spent most of the first ten years of my life there, until we were permitted to leave in 1951. The visit this summer was the first visit back to the land of my birth, and although I have been teaching about China for fifteen years, writing curriculum materials about it and receive several monthly publications from Peking, for the first time in my life, I was finally able to understand much of what Mao was saying in his many essays and books. Only as we visited Yenan, Mao's headquarters during the late 30's and early 40's could I begin to intuit what he really meant by "Serve the People." Only on

seeing a revolutionary opera, starring a likeness of Chou En Lai, was I able to come to understand the need for heroes in a society. Only through visitations to numerous pre-schools did I finally become convinced that cooperative behavior can replace competitive behavior, even among the smallest of children. Only after spending three and half weeks probing and pushing our guides, did I come to understand, once again, the true meaning of patriotism. Only through the intensity of discussion with an educated youth in the poor rural areas of Northwest China did I once again catch the spirit of John F. Kennedy in his "Ask not what your country can do for you, but rather ask what you can do for your country," speech of 1961. Only after leaving my camera on a street corner and my room unlocked for over three weeks did I again come to believe that it is possible for most people in a society to act in honest ways towards their fellow human beings. Only after hearing numerous Chinese praise President Nixon for rescuing them from the Russians, did I finally come to have a slight respect for that most beleaguered of our Presidents. Although China is making strides towards individual freedom, it is still given over to what Marin calls the worship of the state and the near total submission of the individual will, so that in spite of the positive comments I have just made and will continue to make throughout this presentation, it is not a country to which I am attracted as a place to put down my roots, but after the narcissism of Boulder, it was a refreshing breeze to say the least.

I would like to highlight some of those feelings by recounting for you the tale of two departures from Canton to Hongkong. The first took place in 1951, when I was ten years old. During the previous two years, I had been separated from my parents and my father had spent some time in Chinese Communist jails undergoing their now famous brainwashing techniques. We were finally permitted to leave in July, 1951, and though I was only ten years of age, I can remember some of the senses of relief and freedom upon reaching the safety

of Hongkong. I later won five dollars in an American Legion contest for my story of that trip and "What Freedom Means to Me." In June of 1978, there was also a relief to be going home again, but our tour group and Chinese guides had all had such a profound experience that all of us shed many tears of sorrow at having to leave, and upon arrival in Hongkong, I literally locked myself in my hotel room for several hours attempting to overcome the shock of capitalism run wild and the extremes of poverty and wealth all around me in that bizarre enclave on the Chinese mainland. The poignancy and anguish of that experience became even greater when I saw my discarded, beat-up flight bag, with my name and address on it, lying next to a legless, emaciated beggar on Nathan Boulevard, Hongkong's main shopping street.

I would like to turn our attention to a discussion of certain aspects of Maoist-Marxist thought, as they became clearer to me throughout my experience in China. The first concept, and one which permeates not only the rhetoric, but a large portion of the behavior of the Chinese people is that of "Serving the People." This is the title of one of the chapters in the Little Red Book, and although the works of Mao are currently being reinterpreted, and the Little Red Book is not much in evidence, the basic themes given by Mao still dominate the society. Mao states:

> "We should be modest and prudent, guard against arrogance and rashness, and serve the Chinese people heart and soul."[5]

This statement, when juxtaposed against Ringers' comments about doing only those things which give us the greatest amount of pleasure, gives one an insight into the gap between the two societies. Or compare Proposition 13 and the recent Federal Tax Legislation which gives massive aid to the rich, to this comment by Mao.

> Our point of departure is to serve the people whole-heartedly and never for a moment divorce ourselves from the masses, to proceed in all cases from the interests of the people and not from one's self-interest or from the interests of a small group.[6]

Perhaps you are saying about now, all that is very well and good, but don't our Constitution and Declaration of Independence also contain equally as admirable goals and ideals? I would definitely concur with your judgment, but where we in the United States appear to have rejected altruism, social responsibility and selflessness as out-dated concepts, the Chinese appear to have inculcated or indoctrinated, if you prefer, these concepts into hundreds of millions of people, to an extent unheard of in the history of mankind. This is not to say that the Chinese have been successful in creating the "New Man," but at the least, they have been more successful than other regimes at changing human behavior to consider the needs and rights of others in the society. All of this comes, of course, from other Communist writers, not just Chairman Mao, as they all emphasize the solidarity of the masses, and the impossibility of abstention in the moral realm.

Henry Fairlie in his perceptive article in the latest Harpers, "Too Rich for Heroes" captures another aspect of contemporary American society, which differs dramatically from that found in China today. He states:

> A society that has no heroes will soon grow enfeebled. Its purposes will be less elevated; its aspirations less challenging; its endeavors less strenuous. Its individual members will also be enfeebled. They will "hang loose" and "lay back" and be so mellowed out, the last thing of which they wish to hear is heroism. They do not want to be told of men and women whose examples might disturb them, calling them to effort and duty and sacrifice or even a chance of glory. "We have a great many flutes and flageolets," said Emerson, "but not the sound of any fife to summon us." More than a century later, we hardly have even flutes and flageolets, but we do have a great many guitars. Heroes need other music than strumming.[7]

The leaders of Community China have recognized the need for heroes to elevate the spirit of their people and although the current hero is the late

premier Chou En Lai, rather than Chairman Mao, they are still cognizant of Fairlie's point. Mao himself, picked an unlikely hero to set before the Chinese people, namely the Canadian medical doctor Norman Bethune, who helped Mao and his troops during the Long March in the 1930's. The following quotation from Mao's famous essay, "In Memory of Norman Bethune", captures both the altruism spoken of earlier, but also the aspects of heroic myth and legend to which Fairlie calls us.

> Comrade Bethune's spirit, his utter devotion to others without any thought of self, was shown in his boundless sense of responsibility in his work and his boundless warm-heartedness towards all comrades and the people. Every Communist must learn from him....We must all learn the spirit of absolute selflessness from him. With this spirit everyone can be very useful to the people. A man's ability may be great or small, but if he has this spirit, he is already noble-minded and pure, a man of moral integrity and above vulgar interests, a man who is of value to the people.[8]

It doesn't take a genius to recognize the difference between this type of admonition to serve one's fellow man in selfless devotion, and the moral pablum found in most of values clarification and many moral cognitive development programs in American schools today. Is it any wonder that the nation finds itself in a moral vaccuum. If the clarity of the message scares us in light of the dominant moral relativism of American society today, there can be no doubt about the success of their values and moral development program in the schools. Perhaps a little consistency in the socialization process of American children and more clarity about "right and appropriate" behavior would go a long way to solving the problems resulting from the moral and ethical chaos pervading our schools and the society at large today.

Cagan suggests that the didactic models used in the teaching of morality and right conduct appear to be effective in China and other Socialist countries, because unlike American children, children in these societies have important, concrete roles to play.[9] From my observation and experience, I believe her point is well taken. Childhood in China is not preparation for future adult

roles, but active participation in a variety of economic, political and other structures. Almost all school children actually produce some product for sale in the general society. One elementary school we visited produced checker sets for Peking, while a secondary school in Nanching produced radios, televisions and other electronic equipment for sale. Children become active in Communist youth organizations, which lead up to membership in the Party upon readhing adulthood. Children's palaces are provided to give expert instruction to children in the fine arts, athletics, and a variety of other activities. During harvest season, millions of children go into the fields to help with the harvesting. Not only do all these activities teach a variety of skills, but as or more importantly, they teach attitudes towards the dignity of labor, the importance of cooperative effort, in addition, young people are able to model themselves after adult workers in the society, something denied generations of American young people who have been kept out of the job market, and away from any meaningful contact with the "real working world." Chinese young people grow up learning about the heroes at the Tachai commune, who built acqueducts and power plants, terraced the hillsides, and raised their grain production eleven fold, while American young people look to Charlie's Angels and the Fonz for inspiration and direction.

For some years, I have been excited by the ideas of the exiled Brazilian writer Paulo Freire, whose thought stems from both his Christian background as a priest and his connections to Latin American socialist and Marxist thinkers. The key part of his Pedagogy of the Oppressed is his delineation of the praxis, in which any true word consists of two dimensions, reflection and action, "in such radical interaction that if one is sacrificed--even in part--the other immediately suffers...Thus, to speak a true word is to transform the world."[10] The idea is not new to Freiere, as Mao stated many of the same thoughts in his philosophical essay, "On Practice," written in July, 1937. The following quotations from that essay illustrate the point.

> The dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge places practice in the primary position, holding that human knowledge can in no way be separated from practice...Whoever wants to know a thing has no way of doing so except by coming into contact with it, that is, by living (practicing) in its environment...All genuine knowledge originates in direct experience...The knowledge which grasps the laws of the world, must be applied anew to the practice of changing the world. Theory becomes purposeless if it is not connected with revolutionary practice, just as practice gropes in the dark if its path is not illumined by revolutionary theory."

In observing Chinese education, one cannot help but be impressed with the attempts to deal with both Theory and Practice, or as Freire puts it, reflection and action. Freire and Mao both indicate that if a word is deprived of its dimension of action, reflection suffers and the word is changed in "idle chatter, into verbalism, into an alienated and alienating blah."[12] Action demands commitment to transform reality. It would appear to me that American education is caught up on this horn of the dilemma. It is not that we are guilty of speaking untrue words in any theoretical sense, but that our students intuitively know that most of what we utter will not change reality one bit. On the other hand, Mao and Freire warn us that if action or practice is emphasized exclusively, the word is converted into activism, or action for action's sake, thus once again negating a true praxis and making dialogue impossible.

Having judged the American schools for excessive reflection or theory, it would appear that the cultural revolution inching from 1966-76, also was guilty of this overemphasis, though in a much more revolutionary spirit than is true in the U.S. The emphasis upon being Red from 1966-76, has now been replaced by being Expert, to the extent that the first Chinese students arrived at Stanford University earlier this month to take up their studies, and the new regime is attempting to catch up with the rest of the Developed World, not by negating either part of the praxis, but by making sure that they do not raise another generation of ideologically sound, but illiterate young people. The Chinese schools today have entered the age of "back to the basics."

The changes in the educational system since the deaths of Mao and Chou in 1976 have been profound, and it is to those changes that we now turn our attention.

In such a short summary of China and its educational system, one cannot do justice to the complexity of the politics and ideology involved in the shifting perspectives on the role that the schools play in China. Suffice it to say that the schools and politics are inextricably related in China, and that the changes referred to in this final section are not the result of happenstance, but are rather the result of changes in the political power structure and its dominant ideology.

Within a month of Mao's death on September 9, 1976, the "gang of four"--four members of the Politburo closely associated with the Cultural Revolution and its programs, including Mao's widow, Chiang Ch'ing--had been placed under house arrest. They still remain under arrest, and no visitor to China today can escape the constant villification of the "gang of four," with their being blamed for a host of ills which plagued the society from 1966-76. In every factory, commune and school, the constant theme we heard was that the "gang of four" had perverted Maoist-Marxist-Leninist thought to their own purposes, and had led to economic, political, educational, societal disasters to name but a few of the problems. Scapegoating is a common political technique, and my initial reaction was one of skepticism, but as the refrain was repeated over and over again, I became convinced that the Chinese people were genuinely tired of the revolutionary line with its resultant excitement, but inevitable chaos, and sought a return to normalcy and possibly even "revisionism" and "conservatism," although these terms are strongly rejected by current political and educational officials alike.

On the broad political and economic spectrum, there does appear to be a rapid movement to the right, as the emphasis of Chairman Hua is on economic production and development rather than class struggle. The emphasis in the newspapers, what few wall posters are left, and in public speeches is on the "four modernizations" in agriculture, the military, science and technology (including education), and industry. The emphasis today is definitely on being "Expert" rather "Red," and the regime is making every effort to obtain help from the United States, Western Europe and whoever else can help them modernize and mechanize as rapidly as possible. After a decade of sacrifice for the revolutionary ideas of the "gang of four," the Chinese people appear to be genuinely interested in such non-revolutionary goals as a better standard of living, machinery to replace back-breaking labor, and catching up with the rest of the world. One should not over-emphasize this however, as the dedication to the revolution and class struggle continue, but the emphasis today is on moderation and stability.

Having lived and worked in several countries on four continents, I am deeply aware of the fact that political and educational rhetoric and propaganda do not always square with the realities one finds on close inspection of an educational system. For this reason, it is difficult to say just how revolutionary the Chinese educational system was during and after the Cultural Revolution, but at least the articles in Peking Review and China Reconstructs painted a picture of a system radically different from that found in other nations of the world, with the possible exception of Cuba. In recent months, it was becoming obvious to China watchers that the educational rhetoric was changing, and thus not everything we say in the schools was a surprise. The greatest shock, however, was the extent of the near total repudiation of educational revolution wrought during the Cultural Revolution.

Although the exact words were never used, the Chinese are into a definite "back to the basics," movement. Without exception, every teacher and administrator we talked with deplored the excesses during the "gang of four" period, in which excellence was downgraded, teachers were mocked, administrators sent to the rural communes for re-education, and the quality of education reached "abysmal depths." Teachers deplored the waste of a whole generation of young people who were ideologically correct, but could neither read nor write nor cipher. It was almost as if I had never left Boulder or Denver, as we were constantly asked what they could do about the incredibly low levels of mathematics achievement in their schools. This from a nation renowned throughout history for its mathematicians, engineers and physicists. Needless to say, we were unable to share any magic cures, but commiserated with our Chinese colleagues that they were not alone in these problems.

In 1977, admissions examinations to the university were reinstated, with several millions of young people preparing again this year for the few hundred thousands of university openings. Affirmative action programs for the proletarian poor from the working or peasant classes appear to have been replaced by a strict, academic set of criteria, which do not consider to any significant degree, the ideological purity or the class background of the candidate. Coming at the time of the Bakke decision in the U.S., one could not help but draw the connections. Visits with young people who had gone to the countryside during the Cultural Revolution to aid the rural peasant, found them busily preparing for university entrance examinations during their free time, rather than participating in "worker-peasant propaganda teams," which were sent to hospitals, schools and universities during the Cultural Revolution.

On the administrative and organizational level, school principals and university presidents are replacing "revolutionary committees" and "leading members" as the heads of educational institutions. University professors are

being encouraged to return to their classrooms and research, sometimes after as much as a decade, with pay, away from their institutions. People with expertise are being promoted and given pay differentials, sometimes six to eight hundred percent of the beginning wage, to encourage them to practice in their fields of specialization. Centralization is the password today, with nationalized textbooks and curricula, as opposed to the local emphases of the past decade.

During the Cultural Revolution there were constant attempts to shorten the number of years during which young people attended primary, middle or higher education, but today the trend is to lengthen the periods of attendance. While in the past decade, there were efforts to get students out of the classroom and into the fields and factories, the emphasis today is on a solid academic background within the confines of the school. This is not to say that all manual labor has been replaced, as there are still days and even weeks given over to helping with the harvest, or producing products in school workshops.

Cooperative behavior in the classroom has not been entirely abandoned, as communally oriented effort is basic to Maoist-Marxist-Leninist thought, but without a doubt the Chinese system today is considerably more competitive than at any time in the past decade. In most schools and classrooms one can find charts giving not only the academic achievement of each individual child, but also grades on his/her comportment. After the ravages of the Red Guard movement of the sixties, in which chaos often reigned, and the criticism-self-criticism of the seventies under the Cultural Revolution, teachers were unanimous in their praise of return to discipline in the classroom. This is not to say that teachers suffered the assaults that U.S. teachers have been confronted with, but Chinese teachers today applaud the new respect in which their profession is now held by students, parents and the power structure alike.

Grouping has been reinstituted in the schools, and Chinese educators blame the "gang of four" for the "obvious folly" of trying to teach all children

of differing abilities in the same classroom. The downgrading of all things foreign has been replaced by a new respect, at times bordering on reverence, for things from the U.S. and other developed nations. Foreign languages have seen a great revival in the past year, with English now being taught over educational television, and numerous Franch and Spanish classes also being held. One of the high points of my trip was speaking Spanish to some Chinese guides, who were there to conduct tours for the thousands of Latin Americans who were also rushing to visit China. Teachers have been readmicted to the National Trade Union movement after having been expelled by the "gang of four." Key schools, those with special programs, faculty and facilities, have been redesignated throughout the country, and have been given extra funding to develop exemplary programs.

At all levels there is a renewed interest in history, the humanities, social sciences and philosophy, things which had been downgraded or even abandoned during the curriculum reforms of the Cultural Revolution. I will never forget the obvious excitement of a Western trained historian at one of the Universities we visited, who was finally being permitted to write an updated history of the ancient, medieval and modern periods of European history for use in the middle schools and universities. National research institutes are being revived or founded, and although those in the social sciences will no doubt continue to reflect the Maoist-Marxist-Leninist state in which they exist, there is an obvious ferment among the intellectuals.

One could almost see the shackles of revolutionary ideology falling off, as they once again find themselves able to learn from the West and practice their own disciplines.

We were able to see little evidence of the reported "new teaching methods" from the Cultural Revolution. Almost everything we observed was of the strict,

traditional rote memorization format, as one might expect in a Chinese version of "back to the basics." This is not to indicate a harshness or punitive atmosphere, however, as most situations we found to be filled with a sense of purpose and even a warmth.

Needless to say, we were shown the best schools, and although we could roam freely during our spare time, our structured visits were to exemplary institutions. It is from these visits, talks with numerous teachers, administrators, Ministry of Education personnel, students, guides and others with whom we came into contact, that these impressions are formed. Twenty-two days is not long enough to form anything more than surface impressions, however, but when these observations are combined with a careful reading of the constant flow of literature coming from the mainland, and the observations of numerous other visitors, it leads me to believe that my impressions are fairly accurate and that Chinese education today can no longer serve as the revolutionary ideal of the world, as it has come to look more and more like the educational systems one finds throughout most of the First, Second and Third World nations.

In one sense, I regret the passing of the revolutionary system as it was one of the few nations of the world truly struggling on a nationwide scale with the problems of elitism and bureaucratization in the schools, as well as the dilemma of equality and excellence, which John Gardner so well discussed in the American setting. It was one of the few nations which took a serious look at open-door policies and radical affirmative action programs, along with a basic questioning of how much education do we really need, and do we need more active, experiential modes of learning? Along with Cuba, it was one of the only nations to take a serious look at competition and cooperation in the classroom setting, while attempting to put its ideology into practice. All that appears to be over, and I mourn its passing, but I guess I sigh with a bit of relief to know one more experiment failed, and that the "tried and true" ways are now being adopted in the land of my birth, with their half-billion young people. And yet, as I

watch the American educational pendulum swing, who knows, perhaps we will be heading for Cultural Revolution of our own, something much more profound than that experienced in the late sixties here or in China.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Elizabeth Cagan, "Individualism, Collectivism and Radical Educational Reform," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 48, No. 2. May, 1978. pp. 227-235.

[2]Peter Marin, "The New Narcissism" Harpers, Vol. 255, No. 1517, October, 1975, p. 48.

[3]Robert J. Ringer, Looking Out for #1, New York: Fawcett Crest, 1977, pp. 11-12.

[4]Marin, op. cit. pp. 46-47.

[5]Mao Tse-Tung, "China's Two Possible Destinies," Selected Works, Vol. III, Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1971, p. 253.

[6]Mao Tse-Tung, "On Coalition Government," Selected Works, Vol. III, Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1971, p. 315.

[7]Henry Fairlie, "Too Rich for Heroes," Harpers, Vol. 257, No. 1542, p. 33.

[8]Mao Tse-Tung, "In Memory of Norman Bethune," Selected Works, Vol. II, Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1971, pp. 327-333.

[9]Cagan, op. cit., p. 257.

[10]Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, New York: The Seabury Press, 1970, p. 75.

[11]Mao Tse-Tung, "On Practice," Four Essays on Philosophy, Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1966, pp. 3-15.

[12]Freire, op. cit.